



Hurrians and Subarians

Author(s): E. A. Speiser

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 68, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1948), pp. 1-13

Published by: [American Oriental Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/596231>

Accessed: 26/11/2011 02:16

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

“HURRIANS AND SUBARIANS”¹

E. A. SPEISER

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

I

The Hurrian-Subarian issue is compounded of many ingredients. On the surface it is largely a question of terminology. Yet no solution can be attempted without involving a number of other factors: political and cultural history; date, provenience, and character of the sources; and the time and place of their discovery. The importance of the problem as it now confronts us is due primarily to one of its component elements, which the sources designate specifically and unambiguously as “Hurrian.” This group has emerged in recent years as one of the vital factors in the over-all history of the ancient Near East. Because their activities are attested over a considerable period and because they range, furthermore, over the length and breadth of the whole region, the pertinent sources differ widely as to import and dependability. In addition, the evaluation of the available material is further complicated by the circumstance that accidents affecting the order of discovery have left their own confusing marks on the successive stages in the evolution of the problem.

Of the two designations,² “Subarian”³ was the first to confront cuneiformists—in a variety of sources from Mesopotamia. “Hurrian” was encountered later, along the western fringes of the region: first in the Amarna material and thereafter in a steadily increasing body of documents from Anatolia and Syria, including the texts from Ras Shamra (Ugarit). A link between Subarians in the east and Hurrians in the west was established eventually with the aid of personal names—first from Babylonia and subsequently from Nuzi. Meanwhile, extra-cuneiform connections of the Hurrians

proved to include the biblical Horites as well as sundry Egyptian analogues.⁴ With this mounting evidence for the expansion of the Hurrians came also recognition of their substantial influence on other cultures—the Hittite, the Assyrian,⁵ and the Canaanite—involving such fields as political history, law and society,⁶ religion, art,⁷ and linguistics.⁸

Faced thus with a factor as multilateral as it was unexpected, scholars had an understandable concern about the immediate problem of terminology. The earliest choice as an appropriate common term was “Mitannian.” But this designation was gradually superseded by “Subarian,”⁹ which maintained itself until at length it in turn came to be challenged by “Hurrian.”¹⁰ Of late, the

⁴ For the value *hu* in the Egyptian form of this name cf. W. F. Albright, *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography* (1934) 37, 53 f.; note also AASOR 13.27 and Gelb, HaS 50.

⁵ Cf. A. Götze, *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer* (1936).

⁶ This important field of cultural interconnections is only beginning to come in for proper recognition. See Paul Koschaker, ZA 41.1-92; and for suggestions of possible relations with Old Testament material note, e.g., C. Gordon, *Revue Biblique* 1935 1-8; H. Lewy, *Orientalia* 9.366; S. Feigin, *Missitrei Heavar* (1943, in Hebrew) 15 ff.

⁷ Cf. above, note 5. On the subject of the painted pottery from the Hurrian stratum at Billa see provisionally my remarks in *The Museum Journal* 23 (1933) 273 ff., and in *Excavations at Tepe Gawra I* (1936) 161. For “Subartu” ware cf. M. E. L. Mallo-wan (apud F. Thureau-Dangin), RA 36.26-27.

⁸ Cf. *Language* 16 (1940) 338 n.56; *Introduction to Hurrian* (IH, 1941) 61 f.

⁹ For a full account of this problem cf. HaS 1 ff. A. Ungnad first proposed “subaräisch” as the required joint designation in OLZ 1915 241.

¹⁰ Although this term had previously been used by others, the first determined effort to justify it as a common designation for the pertinent elements from both east and west was made, I believe, in the joint statement on “A New Factor in the History of the Ancient East,” published by E. Chiera and myself in AASOR 6 (1936) 75-91. Since Gelb’s remark about this article (p. 6, n. 43) may quite inadvertently give rise to misunderstandings, I wish to make it clear that, in accordance with our advance division of labor, Chiera described the contents of the tablets while my task was limited to their historical and linguistic bearing. The part for which I must accept full responsibility is found on pp. 76-85. It goes without saying, however, that

¹ Cf. Ignace J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians* (Abbr. HaS). The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations, No. 22. The University of Chicago Press: 1944. Pp. xv + 128, with 1 map.

² A third designation, “Mitannian,” was in vogue down to the first quarter of this century, but was eventually given up as inadequate.

³ This English form is the one used by Gelb. It is preferable to the earlier “Subarean,” modeled after the German “subaräisch,” which, in turn, was intended to avoid confusion with a possible “sub-arisch.”

advocates of "Hurrian" have held the upper hand, with the defenders of "Subarian" finding themselves in an ever-dwindling minority.

Gelb's monograph reopens the problem afresh; but it does so on a new basis. The question which it poses is no longer "Hurrian or Subarian?" It is instead, "Hurrians and Subarians?" The author sets out to prove that "from now on it will be necessary to distinguish sharply between two entirely different and unrelated ethnic units: the Subarians, who from the earliest historical periods are found not only occupying vast mountainous areas north of Babylonia but also living peacefully within Babylonia side by side with Sumerians and Akkadians, and the much younger Hurrians, who appeared relatively late on the Mesopotamian scene and who played an important role in the history of the Near East in the 2nd millennium B. C."¹¹

The thesis is set forth with the author's customary incisiveness and care. For all the mass of detail that has already been focused on this subject, Gelb has succeeded not only in reviewing much that by now is old but also in contributing important new material—all this within the space of 115 pages of text. To do the work full justice one would have to comment on virtually each individual point, particularly where one's evaluation differs from the author's. But such an analysis might well result in another monograph on what threatens to become an inflated topic. The present writer is very reluctant to add to the existing imbalance, having had perhaps more than his share in bringing it about in the first place. Yet Gelb's central theory is too far-reaching and significant, and its presentation too competent, to be dismissed with the conventional type of book review. Further, owing to a combination of circumstances, I have been actively interested in various phases of the problem before us for nearly a quarter of a century—which may account for the fact that my

Chiera's over-all contribution is greater than is apparent from his own pages only.

I came back to the problem of terminology—as our material increased and its understanding progressed—on three subsequent occasions: in *Mesopotamian Origins* (MO, 1930) 124 ff.; "Ethnic Movements in the Near East," AASOR 13 (1933) 16-31; and most recently in IH (1941) 1-4. An exhaustive and penetrating defense of the competing designation was made by Ungnad in his *Subartu* (1936).

¹¹ HaS iii.

successive efforts have been accorded prominent attention in Gelb's monograph.¹² I shall address myself, therefore, to the salient points in the author's exposition, and go into detail only where the occasion seems to require it. In general, there is not much relevant material at hand which Gelb appears to have overlooked. And if his final results are acceptable to this writer only in small part, this is so mainly because so much of this topic remains a matter of opinion. That a careful study of Gelb's work cannot but clarify one's own opinions should be amply evidenced by the following pages.

To get down to the heart of the matter, the issue between Gelb and his predecessors cannot be resolved into an "and/or" problem. It is not just a question of "A or B" as against "A alongside B"—a formulation basic to Gelb's argument. To be sure, to Gelb the terms "Hurrian" and "Subarian" are juxtaposed; to others they are (or were) interchangeable, the main points at issue being which of the two merits preference. Yet an absolute equation in this case was scarcely ever intended by those who would relate the two classifications, with the apparent exception of Ungnad whose Pan-Subarianism has been excessive in more ways than one.^{12a} My own stand to date has been for the virtual synonymy of the respective designations, with an emphatic preference for "Hurrian" as the more specific of the two.¹³

Just as the previous students of the problem could not properly insist on the complete synonymy of the disputed terms, so is Gelb in no position to prove that they are distinctive throughout. The reason for such limitations are the same

¹² See above, note 10. Gelb's repeated references to Ungnad's statements and mine are due in considerable measure to our common preoccupation with the preliminary question of nomenclature. That Gelb is well aware of the numerous contributions by other scholars is shown in his references to studies about Hurrian and the Hurrians by Friedrich, Goetze, Thureau-Dangin, and others; cf. JNES 5. 165 n. 2.

^{12a} Thus the inclusion of the Elamite god *Lahurati* in the list of the "SU"-deities is questioned by Ungnad (*Subartu* 66) on the ground that it may be due to wrong ascription or just plainly to scribal error; cf. HaS 16. A warning against Pan-Subarianism (and Pan-Hurrianism) was sounded as early as AASOR 6 (p. 82). It is not altogether out of order even at this late date.

¹³ That the Subarian entries included Akkadian words and that "Subartu" could be applied to Assyria was stressed in AASOR 6. 80.

in both instances: the entries which Akkadian sources mark as Subarian are not in themselves uniform as to origin. These entries have been carefully assembled by Ungnad¹⁴ and are supplemented and discussed by Gelb. Yet the same body of evidence is called upon to bear out two mutually exclusive positions. Ungnad employs the material as proof of his inclusive Subarian theory and assigns it linguistically to that family which others—this time joined by Gelb—classify as Hurrian. On the other hand, Gelb falls back on the same material in defense of his exclusive Subarian hypothesis, arguing that most of it is indeed Subarian, but by the same token non-Hurrian. What is significant, however, in this seeming paradox is the fact that Gelb concedes to Hurrian a portion of the elements which are explicitly designated as Subarian in the cuneiform sources.

There is thus a definite though limited area of agreement between Gelb and the scholars whose views he challenges. He recognizes that Subarian entries include such Hurrian words as *a-a-ra-ḫi* (/ḫiyaruḫhe) 'gold' and *e-ne* 'god' as well as the incontestably Hurrian deities *Te-eš-su!-up* (*Te-šub*) and *Ša-uš-ka*.¹⁵ Both these classes could safely have been expanded.¹⁶ Yet even if we restrict ourselves to elements which Gelb admits to be Hurrian, we must nevertheless add a third class for which the equation Subarian-Hurrian is assured. It is the class of land names which Assyrian

kings listed as Subarian. On closer examination some of these prove to contain significant Hurrian elements. For instance, Tukulti-Ninurta I assigns to the "widespread Subarians" the land of Katmuḫi (HaS 46). It is here that Tiglath-Pileser I reports, about a century and a half later, the capture of the local king "Kili-Tešub, the son of Kili-Tešub, whom they call *irruḫi*" (ibid. 82). In other words, an ethnogeographic name which the Assyrians designated as Subarian (Katmuḫi) has a good Hurrian adjectival suffix (*-ḫi/he*),¹⁷ and is ruled by a king who, like his father, bears a typically Hurrian name, one moreover whose native appellation (*irruḫi*) is based on the Hurrian word for 'king' (*erwi*).¹⁸ Several generations later, under Aššur-dân II, a ruler of Katmuḫi can again be recognized as Hurrian (HaS 82). Yet in spite of this convincing evidence that "Subarian" could be, and indeed was, applied to various Hurrian elements, Gelb writes that in his definition the term "represents an ethnic and linguistic unit hitherto unrecognized" (p. 108).

Gelb's assumption of a distinctive Subarian group suffers, accordingly, from the difficulty that the Subarian rubric embraces elements which Gelb himself identifies as Hurrian. To account for this inconsistency, Gelb would explain the Hurrian items under "Subarian" as forms current in Subartu as a land (p. 17), and hence Subarian in a geographic sense only. At that, the argument might be plausible if Subartu were reasonably definite as a geographic concept. But this is far from being the case. According to Gelb's own recapitulation (p. 88), the "political and geographic unit" which he seeks to localize was one thing to the Babylonians and another thing to the Assyrians. In the former instance it lay "somewhere between the Tigris, the Zagros Mountains, and the Diyala." At times it might stand for the whole North. To the Assyrians, on the other hand, Subartu signified regions in the mountains to the east and north of the Tigris, yet it could extend "sometimes far west into the land of the Amorites and far east into the land of the Elamites." In short, Gelb has to earmark for Subartu a very considerable expanse of territory. What is more, that territory does not constitute an ethnic or

¹⁴ *Subartu* 64 ff.

¹⁵ HaS 16.

¹⁶ Thus *ḫa-a-ra-li* (CT 18 pl. 3 rev. v 21), glossed *da-al-tum* 'door,' (ibid. vi 1; cf. C. Frank, MAOG 4. 43; *Subartu* 95; HaS 16) can scarcely be separated from *ḫi-ri-nu-ḫi* (Sumero-Hurrian Vocabulary from Ras Shamra (i 25; cf. Syria 12. 237 and pl. L), which corresponds to Sum. *ig* 'door.' Omitting the respective formatives, we obtain RŠ Voc. **hiri* = (SUKI) **hara*, both glossed with terms for 'door.' Gelb might also have added *aš-tu* (CT 18 pl. 19 obv. 24), which is glossed *šam[ḫatum]* (cf. Frank, loc. cit.; *Subartu* 96). For although the ascription reads *bir*, instead of *Su-bir*, the connection with Hurrian *ašti/é* 'woman' is difficult to ignore. Likewise mention should have been made of [...]-*uš-ḫi* (CT 18 pl. I col. i 24), labeled SUKI; for we have here a well-established Hurrian formative (cf. Speiser, IH 132 f.), which occurs, among other usages, with types of building—as is apparently the case in the present example. Gelb (HaS 16) is, furthermore, unduly skeptical about the Hurrian character of the deity *Aš-tu-u-pi-nu*; cf. RŠ alphabetic *aštā* (Syria 10, pl. LXIV 4. 29) and C-G. v. Brandenstein, MVAeG 46. 2. 46.

¹⁷ Cf. J. Friedrich, *Analecta Orientalia* 12 (1935) 122 ff.; Speiser, IH 114 f.

¹⁸ As recognized by Gadd, Ungnad, and Oppenheim; cf. HaS 82.

political vacuum in so far as historical inscriptions are concerned. The areas reserved by Gelb for the Babylonian concept of Subartu are known independently to have been occupied by Elamites, Kassites, Lullu, and Gutians. When Gelb suggests (*loc. cit.*) that all these groups shared certain areas with the Subarians, he is obviously at pains to solve this very difficulty. But once these ethnic elements have been domiciled, where is there any room left for the "vast mountainous areas north of Babylonia" (p. iii) in which Gelb would place the Subarians? He could not be thinking of the space beyond the Elamite-Gutian belt, because the inscriptions presuppose something much closer to Babylonia; and he himself has called attention to the fact that, on Hammurabi's testimony, Subartu was situated between Babylonia and the mountains east of Kirkuk.¹⁹ As for the Subartu of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Subarians to the east of Assyria must leave room for the "region of the widespread Gutians"²⁰ as well as the Lullu and Kassites. An added difficulty is created by the recurring references to the "widespread Subarians" to the west and northwest of Assyria (HaS 46), which is precisely the territory that figures otherwise as good Hurrian stamping ground.²¹ The solution in this particular case would seem to be self-evident, in view of the positive link between Hurrians and Subarians in the instance of Katmuḫi (see above), coupled with the strong probability that the same is true also of the other westerly groups of Subarians mentioned in the records of the kings of Assyria.²² Yet Gelb seems to ignore the force of this evidence—not to speak of the lexical and onomastic contacts between Hurrian and Subarian which he has himself conceded—when he states (p. 88) that "no common bond between the Subarians and the Hurrians is evident in our available sources." To the contrary, more than one such common bond is in plain sight.

¹⁹ HaS 38 f. More specifically, the order was Nippur, Subartu, and Ḥamazi. Th. Jacobsen places Ḥamazi near modern Sulaimania (*The Sumerian King List* [AS 11] 97 f., n. 106). This takes us into the Lullu-Zamua country (cf. AASOR 8.14 ff.), which is not without significance for the whole problem, as will be shown later.

²⁰ Cf., e. g., AOB I 60.21-2; see also Speiser, MO 96 ff. It is worth emphasizing that the Gutians, in common with the Subarians, were described as "widespread."

²¹ Cf. Goetze, JNES 5.168.

²² *Ibid.*, n. 26.

II

Does it follow then that Gelb's argument in favor of Subarians as distinct from Hurrians is altogether without foundation? Not necessarily. For an independent re-examination of the material assembled in Gelb's monograph leaves one—at least it leaves the present writer—with this conclusion: When all the common ties between the two groups under dispute have been accounted for, there remains a residue of things "Subarian" which cannot be identified with known Hurrian elements. The material is by no means as substantial as Gelb believes, but neither is it as negligible as others, myself included, have hitherto assumed. A small part of the matter thus isolated is clearly Semitic. Enough of it, however, is neither Hurrian nor Semitic. It calls for further examination.

Since the total amount of the pertinent material is far from extensive, the task of sifting it should not be unduly cumbersome. The lexical and onomastic entries referred to earlier in this discussion have to be left aside for the present, both because they are inconsistent and ambiguous in themselves and because of their usually late date. Since the available geographic and general historical references are likewise inconclusive, our basic source for this inquiry narrows down to a handful of personal names—twenty-three²³ dated to the Ur III period and five to the Old Babylonian period—which the texts have provided with the label "Subarian."²⁴ These names, painstakingly assembled in his Appendix II, constitute the core and point of departure of Gelb's theory. From Ur III we have also another list of personal names (presented in Appendix III) which lack explicit identification but are readily recognized as Hurrian on internal linguistic grounds. Since the two lists—Gelb argues—are not interrelated linguistically,²⁵ it follows that they refer to two independent ethnic-linguistic units; Subarian proves thereby to be distinct from Hurrian. Granting that three names in the Subarian

²³ Gelb lists twenty-four such names, counting *Zigume* (p. 105). However, No. 23 of his list is . . . -at, which is useless for purposes of analysis.

²⁴ Through the writings (*lú* or *sal*) SU.AKI, *Šu-bir₄KI*, *Šubariyūm*, or *Šubaritum*.

²⁵ That in a few instances interrelationship between the two lists is not only possible but likely will be indicated presently in connection with four names of the Subarian list which may be presumed to be Hurrian.

list are Semitic, Gelb goes on to ask (p. 108): If the rest of the names are neither Hurrian nor Semitic, then what are they?" His conclusion is that, "The answer is clear and simple: they are Subarian." And he proceeds to define this last term as signifying an ethnic and linguistic unit spread over extensive areas of the Fertile Crescent.

Even if Gelb's protasis were wholly valid, his apodosis still would not follow automatically. Sumerian, Old Akkadian, and Old Babylonian records speak of various lands and peoples other than Subarian which need have neither Hurrian nor Semitic connections. Let us first see, however, how far Gelb's protasis holds true. In other words, can it be asserted with confidence that, aside from the three names which are obviously Semitic (*Rībamili*, *Eštar* . . . , and *Ummi-Hebet*, pp. 105-7), all of the remaining elements are definitely without known connections?

As co-author of the model study on *Nuzi Personal Names*,²⁶ Gelb is of course aware of the fact that four of the names in his Subarian list are duplicated, in whole or in part, in the Nuzi material. This awareness he shares fully with the reader. All who have worked on the non-Semitic elements at Nuzi will readily agree with Gelb when he states (p. 111) that the linguistic character of some of these elements remains doubtful. How much reasonable doubt, however, should be entertained in the case of the four names in question is another matter. One of these names is *Du-li-ia* (p. 101). This hypocoristic form confronts us at Nuzi a number of times,²⁷ in the present spelling as well as in its non-distinctive variant *Tu-li-ia*. Moreover, Gelb concedes (p. 18) that the root *tul* appears in the unmistakably Hurrian compound *Tulip-apu*, and also in *Tul-Tešup*.²⁸ He adds, however, the warning that "in short names a similarity of sounds may be purely accidental."²⁹ In other words, Nuzi *Du-li-ia* is definitely Hurrian, yet the identical Ur III form is regarded as suspect. But if Gelb dismisses this comparison—the only one available, incidentally, and formally faultless—as unsafe, he is scarcely on safe ground in seeking to

place the same short form—this time wholly unsupported—in his distinctive Subarian group. Another of the names is *Zi-gu-um-e* (not *Zi-gu-la-e* as previously read, cf. HaS p. 105). Its Nuzian analogue is *Zi-ku-um-mi* (cf. *ibid.*). Not only is the first element of this form frequently attested at Nuzi,³⁰ but the bearer of the name has a son who is incontestably Hurrian,³¹ a suggestive if not decisive feature. Furthermore, the element *-ummi* is known from Hurrian, where it is probably an infinitive marker.³² All in all, the choice would seem to lie between Hurrian and a vacuum. The remaining two names are *Da-šu-uk* (p. 101) and *Šu-šu!-uk* (104). While these precise combinations are not paralleled at Nuzi, the ending *-uk* is quite common (p. 101). In names like *Hašuk* and *Kaltuk* this element is found with forms which are well attested in Hurrian,³³ so that the Hurrian character of the whole becomes highly probable, especially since the formative *-uk(k)* is independently established in Hurrian contexts.³⁴ In short, the least that can be said about all four of the names before us is that all the evidence at our disposal points in the direction of Hurrian. One may choose to wait for absolute confirmation, but by the same token one should not at this time use these very names as indirect proof of other unspecified linguistic affiliations.

So far seven of the twenty-eight names in Gelb's basic list have had to be ruled out, three because they are certainly Semitic and four because they are in all probability Hurrian. Nor is there a clear-cut case in favor of Gelb's theory in the remaining three-quarters of the material. *Ra-ši* (p. 104) was viewed by Ungnad as Akkadian, which Gelb regards as possible, though he calls attention to alternate Elamitic claims of this form. *Ga-ra!-da-*

²⁶ NPN 176-7.

²⁷ *Hišmi-Tilla*, *ibid.* 177.

²⁸ Speiser, *IH* 128 f.

²⁹ A fact overlooked by Gelb; *haš* is the common root for 'hear' and *kalt* occurs in the form *gal-te-ni-we/a*, cf. D. Cross, *Movable Property in the Nuzi Documents* (AOS 10) 34; Similarly, e. g., HSS 13.72.7 and 122.19 (*ga₄-al-ti-ni-wa*). More instructive, however, for onomastic purposes would be *keldi* 'well-being,' cf. *IH* Index, p. 220. In the case of *Hašuk*, a connection with Elamite *haštuk* (cf. ZA 41 52 ff., n. 6) is possible but not likely.

³⁴ *IH* 134. Cf. also the occupational term *zazukkū* (HSS 13.363.67, 73) which seems to correspond to *mušelwū* and is probably based on Akk. *zāzu* (note *ū-zi-i-zu* l. 79), but carries the Hurrian suffix *-ukku*.

²⁶ Together with P. M. Purves and A. A. MacRae, *OIP* 57 (1943). Abbreviated henceforward as NPN.

²⁷ NPN 157.

²⁸ This is Gelb's normalization, on the basis of NPN. My own reading, on the basis of *IH*, would be *Tulib-abu* and *Tul-Tešub*, voice in Hurrian being subject to non-phonemic positional variation.

²⁹ HaS 18.

du (p. 101) has been read *Ga-šid!-da-du* by Ungnad and Stamm and interpreted as Akkadian; Gelb's argument against it begs the question. That two other names, *Ad-da-bu-ni* and *Iâ-ab-ra-at* (pp. 101-2) have impressive Elamitic credentials is made clear by Gelb himself. The same text which introduces *Addabuni* and *Raši* gives us also eight other names of Gelb's list, the concluding notation *lû SU-me*, something like "these being Subarians," apparently embracing all ten names. Presumably therefore the ten individuals in question fall within the general Elamite orbit. This possibility is partly strengthened by the circumstance that one of the names involved is *Ba-ar-ba-ra-gi* (p. 101); for it may not be too far-fetched to adduce as a pertinent structural analogue the place-name *Lagalaga* (written also *Tagalaga* and *Lagabgalaga*), which has been located in the Sulaimania area (ancient Lullu-Zamua).³⁵ The element *laga* in turn may have Gutian affiliations.³⁶ Instead of setting up a separate Subarian group, there is thus reason for operating tentatively with a Gutu-Lullu-Elamite sphere. It is little enough to go by, to be sure, in the present state of our knowledge. But what little there is has at least a positive slant, whereas the Subarian hypothesis has been seen so far to rest entirely on negative arguments. Suggestively enough, a further name in Gelb's list is *Lu-lu*, "presumably derived from Lullu(bi)." ³⁷

The number of names still to be accounted for has by now been reduced to six. Three of these designate messengers of Yabrat (*Bušut*, *Zurzura*, and .. *abduša*). One is *Yušanak*, a not improbable accession to the Elamite group. Of *Šunundu* one can say only that it is associated with *Šušuk* (p. 104), which has already been discussed. Finally, *Mamma* (p. 106) is, as Gelb himself says, the sort of "Lallwort" that cannot be assigned with certainty to any particular language.

Summing up, there is not a single name in Gelb's whole list which fails to show some kind of

affiliation with one of the previously known ethnic or linguistic groups. None can be made to justify the establishment of Subarian as a separate and distinctive entity. The results have not been, however, entirely negative. For they constitute cumulative evidence that the term "Subarian" was applied at the time in question not only to Semitic and probably Hurrian elements, but also to Elamites and some of their neighbors. In terms of Gelb's theory there remains only this modest, though important, gain: The terms "Hurrian" and "Subarian" were by no means coextensive.

III

We must start then afresh with the knowledge that even the earliest available linguistic evidence fails to impart to "Subarian" a distinctive connotation. The term was a non-specific one as far back as the Ur III period. Nevertheless, it could not have been so from the outset, for in that case it would have been practically meaningless as a geographic designation. Indeed, such pertinent historical inscriptions as we possess, down to Old Babylonian times, would seem to presuppose a definite location for Subartu. This is apparent from writings like *Su-bir₄*^{KI} and *Šubur^{KI}* (with the place-determinative), and from the use of these forms alongside specific land-names such as Elam, Gutium, and the like. Unfortunately, the records are not explicit enough to enable us to locate the place under discussion with any degree of precision. It is possible, however, to arrive at an approximate location. The careful surveys of the source material by Ungnad and Gelb³⁸ make it unnecessary to attempt at this time anything more than a comprehensive summary.

From pre-Sargonic times, Lugal-anni-mundu of Adab lists Subartu after the Cedar Mountains, Elam, Marḥaši, and Gutium, but before Amurru and Sutium. Eannatum of Lagash cites it between Elam and Urua.³⁹ The relevant Sargonic material happens to be known only from later copies. Yet here again Subartu is associated with Elam, Baraḥšum (i. e. Marḥaši), and the Cedar Forest;⁴⁰ in another instance it is followed by Gutium and Elam. In the Ur III period the Subarians are

³⁵ Cf. AASOR 8.17.

³⁶ Speiser, MO 98-9.

³⁷ HaS 103. Cf. also MO 88 ff. Note also B. Landsberger's "Ḫabiru and Lulabḫu" (KF I [1929] 321-34) which suggests how the last-named term might have developed into an appellative from an original ethnic designation. Although material on the subject is still all too scanty, it is becoming increasingly more apparent that the Lullu succeeded in impressing themselves upon their contemporaries far beyond the limits of their home territories; see below, n. 86.

³⁸ *Subartu* 31 ff.; HaS 31 ff.

³⁹ On Urua see HaS 34 n. 82.

⁴⁰ That the Cedar Forest is not necessarily to be sought in the Amanus is recognized by Gelb, *ibid.* 35-6.

linked directly with the Elamites.⁴¹ And the stages of Išbi-Irra's victorious progress are given as Nippur, *Su-bir*⁴², and Ḥamazi.⁴³ Finally, the Old Babylonian age signifies its awareness of Subartu in several ways. This land is mentioned five times in Hammurabi's year names;⁴⁴ in two of these it is explicitly linked with Ešnunna and Gutium. A fragmentary historical inscription of the same ruler⁴⁵ speaks of "the people of Elam(?), Gutium, Subartu, (and) Tukriš," adding significantly that "their mountains are distant and their language intricate (*egru*)." The contemporary Mari letters reflect an alliance between the Subarians and the Elamites. Yet already at this time it becomes apparent that Subartu was beginning to lose such specific connotation as it may have had at the start. For the term seems capable of embracing Assyria,⁴⁵ as it certainly was to do in later times. But its subsequent employment by the Assyrians departs notably from southern usage.

Looking back on the above ethnogeographic evidence as a whole, we can say that, although no precise localization of Subartu is possible, the cumulative bearing of the material at hand favors a restricted area to the north of Babylonia and to the northwest of Elam. This would seem to point approximately to the region of the Lullu (known independently for their affiliations with the Guti), in the area of modern Sulaimania. One reason for this suggestion is the close connection of Subartu with Marḥaši⁴⁶ and Gutium. Another is the mention of the land in connection with Ḥamazi—which has been placed in the Sulaimania area. The terse text which gives us this information does no more, to be sure, than accord Subartu a position between Nippur and Ḥamazi. Fortunately, however, additional material—hitherto unknown—would seem to make the link between Subartu and Ḥamazi an intimate one indeed. I

owe this information to my colleague, Dr. S. N. Kramer, and I cannot do better than let him speak for himself in the appended footnote which he has very kindly made available to me.⁴⁷ It is worth stressing in this connection that the fragment of the Enmerkar poem previously published by Kramer (JAOS 63.191 ff.) reflects a concept of the universe which differs axially and in extent from the later stereotypes (cf., e. g., *Subartu* 61, 77 f.) in which Subartu represent the North and Elam the East. For in this text, dated to approximately 2000 B. C. but obviously containing much older material, it is Akkad that stands for the North whereas the East (or perhaps the Northeast) is summed up under Šubur (Subartu), evidently coupled with Ḥamazi. The division of the universe seems to have been guided here by relatively near neighbors of Sumer, with Sumer itself marking the South. This may account not only for the fact that synonym lists and syllabaries came to

⁴⁷ [In JAOS 63.191-4 I published an extract from the Sumerian epic tale "Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta" whose fifth line reads: *u₄-ba kur-šubur ki-hé-me-zi*, which I translated without question and comment as "In those days, the land Šubur, the place of plenty, of righteous decrees." This translation was based on a rather synthetic analysis of the last complex in which it was assumed that *hé* and *me-zi* were appositional genitives, each governed by the preceding *ki*; the entire complex *ki-hé-me-zi* was thus taken to be parallel in construction to *kur-gal-me-nam-nun-na-kam* which modifies *ki-en-gi* in the line immediately following. What I failed to note, however, is the fact that the Sumerian complex corresponding to the English "of righteous decrees" would read *me-zi-da* and not *me-zi*, since the grammatical form is *me-zid-a(k)*. In any case, unless I am very much mistaken, the attempted translation was erroneous and the real meaning of *ki-hé-me-zi* is to be sought elsewhere. In a duplicate of the "Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta" poem which I copied in Istanbul (cf. BASOR 104.10-12; for photographs of the tablet see JCS 1 plates I and II, following p. 112; the duplicate of the extract published in JAOS begins on pl. I col. iii line 18; the line under discussion is *ibid.* 23) the corresponding line is probably to be restored to read [*u₄-ba kur-šubur ki-ha-m]a-zi^{ki}* "In those days the land Šubur (and) the place Ḥamazi." Another possible but rather unlikely translation would be: "In those days the land Šubur of the place Ḥamazi." For the various writings of Ḥamazi cf. Jacobsen, AS 11.97 n. 106; for *ki* preceding a place name cf., e. g., AS 12.16 line 11 and n. 3.

It thus appears more than likely that the *ki-hé-me-zi* of the extract published in JAOS is nothing more than a phonetic variant for *ki-ha-ma-zi^{ki}*. Moreover, according to our poet, the eastern world division consists of the two lands Šubur and Ḥamazi, and not of Šubur alone. S. N. K.]

⁴¹ These two groups joined to bring an end to the dynasty; cf. *ibid.* 39.

⁴² *Ibid.* 38-9. For the location of Ḥamazi cf. above, n. 19.

⁴³ *Subartu* 45 ff.; HaS 41.

⁴⁴ *Ur Royal Inscriptions* 146 iv; *Subartu* 48. Definite proof that this text is to be assigned to Hammurabi was discovered by Gelb, HaS 41 n. 128.

⁴⁵ HaS 42-3.

⁴⁶ For the location of this district, which figures prominently in Sargonic times under the form Barahšum, see Albright, JAOS 45 (1925) 232; he proposes southeastern Luristan; note also Speiser, MO 31 n. 22, and HaS 35 n. 90.

associate Subartu with Elam (HaS 92 f.), but also for the broad application of the term in general which is witnessed in later times.

It would clearly be premature to propose at the present stage that the terms Subartu and Lullu-land were virtually synonymous at an early period and that echoes of this correspondence persisted in later Akkadian records, for all the modifications that the first term may have acquired in course of time. It may not be amiss, however, to list very briefly the various reasons that would seem to support such an assumption: (1) The geographic arguments, as summed up in the two preceding paragraphs. (2) While there is no definite linguistic evidence—such direct references as that the Lullu call this place *Kinipa* or that place *Arakdi*⁴⁸ are far from sufficient—the Subarian list (see above) includes not only *Barbaragi*⁴⁹ but also *Lulu*. The occurrence of *Lu-lu Šubur* in Fara, whose potential significance is recognized by Gelb,⁵⁰ may indicate that the two components dovetailed⁵¹ as far back as the Early Dynastic period. (3) The importance of the Lullu in the Sargonic age is attested in Narām-Sin's record of victory against Satuni of Lulu(be)⁵² and in the stele of the Lullubian king Annubanini.⁵³ Yet the later copies of Narām-Sin's inscriptions speak of Subartu just where Lullu is expected. The omission of Lullu in the context that tells us of the distant mountains and intricate languages⁵⁴ of "the people of Elam(?), Gutium, Subartu, (and) Tukriš" is surely noteworthy. The difficulty disappears, however, if it is assumed that Subartu and Lullu might

interchange.⁵⁵ (4) It may not be without significance that the Old Babylonian texts referred to above have a good deal to say about Subartu and Subarians, but nothing about Lullu. Conversely, the Nuzi texts, which list a variety of countries,⁵⁶ make frequent reference to Lullu, but none to Subartu or Subarians.⁵⁷ (5) The last-cited argument gains in force when coupled with the following consideration. The Old Babylonian documents as well as the Nuzi texts share a predilection for a particular type of slaves. In the one instance, however, these slaves are designated as Subarian, in the other as Lullu.⁵⁸ (6) Lastly, for all the differences between scholars in their evaluation of the term "Subarian," there is general agreement that among its connotations was that of an appellative. That the same holds true of "Lullu" has been plausibly argued by Landsberger.⁵⁹

None of the points just enumerated may be sufficient in itself to establish identity of the two terms in question. One or more might be weakened, or even refuted, on the basis of further study or new material. Yet their cumulative weight is difficult to ignore altogether. It would be hazardous to suggest at present what the whole adds up to. It may be that there was some such place as **Šubr* in or near the Lullu country which came to be confused by the Sumerians or Akkadians with the name of that country itself so that both designations remained current. The confusion may have been aided, or even started, thanks to some analogy, say, within Sumerian.⁶⁰ If no

⁴⁸ AASOR 8.18, 20.

⁴⁹ See above, n. 35. The same Zamua district which has furnished us with a possible analogue of this name may also contain material of interest to the student of Nuzi names. Thus the name *Winnirge*, which has puzzled Purves (NPN 275 and AJSL 56.183), seems to find a structural parallel in *Bidirgi*, as was suggested in AASOR 8.21 n. 38.

⁵⁰ HaS 32.

⁵¹ That they were not identical throughout is apparent from the occurrence of *Tul-tul Šubur* in the same texts; cf. *ibid.*; see also below, n. 60.

⁵² DEP II 53; cf. also Sidney Smith, EHA 96-7.

⁵³ Speiser, MO 89. The fact that the "Subarian" slaves were to be obtained in such places as Ešnunna can mean no more than that they went through intermediate trading centers; cf. *Subartu* 145.

⁵⁴ See above, n. 44. It should be noted that the text actually says "language," not "languages." Does this mean that the speech of all four groups sounded alike to the writer?

⁵⁵ It should be pointed out that in the geographic treatise published as KAV 92, Subartu and Lullubi appear as separate entities (3:12; 37:39). In the first instance Subartu is associated with Anz/šan while Lullubi follows Arrapha; in the second, Subartu follows Akkad, and Lullubi should be read after Turukki, the passage being obviously in disorder; cf. Albright, JAOS 45.235 and Ungnad, *Subartu* 40. However, whether the original be ascribed to Sargon I of Assyria or to Sargon of Akkad, the extant text is a Neo-Assyrian copy; and by that time the term Subartu had gone through various stages of development.

⁵⁶ Cf. E. R. Lacheman, BASOR 78 (1940) 18 ff.

⁵⁷ Any suggestion to the effect that Subartu was subsumed under Hanigalbat, which is frequently mentioned in these texts (*ibid.* 20-21), would be tantamount to grouping the Subarians with the Hurrians.

⁵⁸ Speiser, MO 101 ff.; *Subartu* 100 ff.; HaS 43 f.

⁵⁹ See above, n. 37.

⁶⁰ A likely possibility for such an analogy is present in the place-name written 𒀠.𒀭.𒀭.𒀭, interchangeably with 𒀠.𒀭.𒀭.𒀭, and used for more than one specific city. A considerable literature has grown up concerning the

confusion actually arose, **Šubr*, or the like, could have been no more than a neighbor of Lullu, Gutium, and Elam, whose onetime political prominence dissipated in early times but whose name survived as a more or less free agent. We are now in the realm of speculation that cannot be pursued with profit. What seems to be abundantly clear, however, is that by the time of Ur III 'Subarian' had ceased to be distinctive linguistically and was becoming more and more vague geographically. For this last-named reason the term lent itself to various secondary applications. One of these was to designate Assyria, as seen from the south. Another was to signify the Hurrians, as viewed from Assyria.

That names connected with lands and peoples often show great versatility is a point which requires no special emphasis. It holds true no matter whether such a connection be primary or secondary; and it remains valid also with regard to derived linguistic designations. In some instances the original range has been notably enlarged; cf., e.g., *Allemands*, *Graeci*,⁶¹ *Palaistinē*. In others it has been curtailed to the drastic extent seen in Nuzi *kinahhū* (based on the Hurrianized form of the

native term for 'Phoenicia')⁶² or in our *indigo*—in both cases to denote nothing more than certain types of dyes. Again, as secondary applications, such names may have developed from adjectives with the sense of 'strange, foreign,' or the like. One such example is *Welsh*, which may apply not only to Celts but also—as in Polish—to Italians (*Włosi*) and Rumanians (*Wolosi*).⁶³ Another pertinent and instructive illustration is Heb. *ʾîz*. In Psalms 114.1 this root is employed for a foreign language, as it also is used, with local modifications, in Arabic (*lǧz*) and Syriac. In Hellenistic times the Hebrew element became specialized for 'Greek,' aside from bearing also a pejorative connotation (cf. our *welsh*). Subsequently, in keeping with the cultural and political developments of the times, the meaning 'foreign' reasserted itself. Now when Hammurabi stigmatized the speech of some of his opponents as *egru* ('intricate, complicated'),⁶⁴ he was evidently using the term in the sense of the Psalmist's *lōʾēz*. Significantly enough, one of the places to which he thus referred was Subartu, along with three other lands in the same general neighborhood.

In the above case of Hammurabi's invasion of the field of linguistics, the descriptive adjective which he employed had the character of a catchall, while the proper names listed in that same context were used presumably in their individual connotations. On the other hand, when the Ur III texts or the Old Babylonian documents employ the term 'Subarian,' we are confronted with a one-time geographic term that appears to have lost its specific value and become inclusive—to judge from the fact that it is made to embrace more than one linguistic group.⁶⁵ The usage would vary accord-

correct reading and interpretation of these forms; for the most recent discussions cf. *Subartu* 28-30; Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List* 88-9 n. 126; and HaS 94-8. Two apparently unrelated readings of these signs are offered by the syllabary material: one is *šū-ba-ri* and the other *ku-u₈-a-ra* (Jacobsen, loc. cit.). Inasmuch as 𒊕.𒀭.𒀭.𒀭 can be read *ku₆-aKI*, and in view of the further fact that amissible final consonants were not expressed in older Sumerian orthography, Jacobsen regards *ku'-a/ku'ara* > *kuwara* > *kubara* as original and *šubari* as a corruption due to an easy misreading. Sight should not be lost, however, of the further possibility that *ku-* and *šū-* might have a common phonetic source; cf. Speiser, MO 55. At any rate, one of the cities written 𒊕.𒀭.𒀭.𒀭 is associated from earliest Sumerian times with Eridu and, as such, could not have anything to do with Subartu; even Ungnad stresses this point, cf. *Subartu* 29. Further, the common personal name Šubur in the Fara texts "must doubtless be considered Sumerian" (HaS 31), whatever its ultimate origin. Finally, there is evidence for equating Sum. *šubur* with Akk. *eršetum* 'earth' (ibid. 23). There would seem thus to be ample room within early Sumerian for the popularity of an element like **Šubr* and for its broader employment in instances which stricter analysis would have ruled out. For a partial parallel cf. our usage of *Dutch* (originally cognate with *deutsch*), not only in the accepted meaning 'pertaining to the Netherlands' but also in its loose and colloquial application 'German.'

⁶¹ To use examples given by Gelb, HaS 14, 87.

⁶² *Language* 12 (1936) 121 ff. Conversely, the Greek name for 'Phoenicia' might well have been based on the term for 'red purple'; see ibid., and cf. W. F. Albright, "Canaanites in the History of Civilization," *Studies in the History of Culture (Leland Volume)* 25 f. (It seems to me unlikely, however, that the Canaanites themselves should have called their land after 'Purple,' loc. cit.)

⁶³ To these examples which Gelb cites alongside English *Wal(l)achians* (HaS 87) should be added the corresponding land names *Wlochy* and *Wolochy*.

⁶⁴ See above, note 44, and cf. W. von Soden, ZA 41 (1933) 170 n. 3.

⁶⁵ It was in the sense of such a catchall that I sought to employ—although the intended range was much broader—the terms "Japhetic, Japhethite" in MO. The result has not been wholly satisfactory in that various

ing to the time, the user, and the need. The one common denominator in this particular case, in so far as Sumer or Babylonia were concerned, would seem to be an association with the north or northeast. Aside from this basic restriction there was ample room for changes and shifts of emphasis; enough so to make it possible for Assyria and things Assyrian to qualify eventually under Subartu.⁶⁶

It goes without saying that Hurrian elements could be included in this progressively broadening concept of 'Subarian.' That this actually happened may be inferred from the following. The native term for 'Hurrian' is known only from the western fringes of the area covered by Sumerian and Akkadian records.⁶⁷ Yet it is abundantly clear that the Hurrians were no strangers to Sumer and Akkad, Babylonia and Assyria. Hurrian rulers of neighboring states become known as early as the Old Akkadian period. In this group belong *Ari-sen*, king of Urkiš and Nawar, **Ankis-adal*, king of Karḫar, and *Puttim-adal*, king of Šimurru.⁶⁸ A mythic-historical text relating to the same period lists a *Kiklib-adal*⁶⁹ as the king of Tukriš (preceded by rulers of Lullu and Elam). The name is plainly Hurrian and the land in question is the same which Hammurabi described as using an *egru*-tongue, in common with Subartu, Gutium, and Elam(?). In other words, Hammurabi's description may well have been aimed at Hurrian, among other languages, if indeed he was able to differentiate among them.⁷⁰ At all events, Hurrians confront the south in approximately the same territory that the south was wont to refer to as Subartu. In these circumstances it would have been difficult indeed to avoid an equation between the two concepts, however disparate their respective origins. To be sure, the relatively numerous Hurrian names from Ur III which Gelb has collected (HaS, Appendix III) lack specific ethnic identifi-

readers (but not Gelb) have misunderstood these designations to imply ethnic or linguistic relations.

⁶⁶ Cf. HaS 42 f., 88.

⁶⁷ Namely, Syria and Anatolia. Gelb's suggestion that the ethnicon may be present in the Mari material published so far (HaS 63) is questioned by Goetze, JNES 5.168 n. 29.

⁶⁸ Cf. HaS 55 ff.

⁶⁹ KUB XXVII 38 iv 14. The complete form is *IKi-ik-li-pa-ta-al-li-in*, but the final *-(i)n* is a syntactic element (Speiser, IH 167 ff.) and not a nominal suffix as Gelb suggests (HaS 55); see below, n. 86.

⁷⁰ Cf. above, note 54.

cation. There is good reason, however, for the premise that explicitly Subarian lists include four names which may be regarded as Hurrian.⁷¹ Hence it would not be unduly hazardous to posit that, in the usage of Sumer and Akkad, 'Subarian' had come to include Hurrians not later than the Ur III period. There is no evidence against such an assumption. Neither is there any indication that other terms for Hurrians were used in that area. What positive evidence there is favors the connection.

With regard to Assyria, the situation was of a different order. For one, the records do not take us back to the third millennium, a time when Subartu appears to have enjoyed—at least initially—a distinctive geographic connotation. For another, Assyrian historical tradition is far more uniform than that of the south. Lastly, what was north or northeast from a vantage point in Lower Mesopotamia, was from the standpoint of Aššur either Assyria itself or the lands to the east of it. Accordingly, the south's employment of 'Subarian' in a geographic sense could have no exact parallel in Assyria. Besides, such groups as the Lullu or the Gutu were too constant and definite a factor to be described by vague or catchall terms. It follows therefore that in Assyrian usage 'Subarian'^{71a} would be expected to carry a distinctively ethnic meaning. Little argument is needed to show that such an expectation is fully borne out by the evidence.

This evidence concerns primarily the latter half of the second millennium, that is, the formative period of the Assyrian Empire. In the fourteenth and early thirteenth centuries, from the time of Aššur-uballit I to that of Shalmaneser I, the Subarians are placed to the east of Assyria and are usually linked directly to the Lullu.⁷² Beginning with Tukulti-Ninurta I, however, in the second half of the thirteenth century, the seats of the Subarians are located west of Assyria.⁷³ The evi-

⁷¹ See above, p. 5. Further proof of Hurrian contacts with Lower Mesopotamia not later than the Ur III period is inherent in the character of the Hurrian syllabary which was based on a model close to Old Akkadian; cf. IH 13 f.

^{71a} The statement "we are Subartu" in an Assyrian astrological report is convincingly explained by Gelb (HaS 88) as a gloss made necessary by the essentially Babylonian background of this type of material.

⁷² Cf. HaS 45 f. and the literature there cited.

⁷³ Ibid. 46.

dence as a whole admits of only one possible interpretation: in the historical records of Assyria the term 'Subarians' is applied specifically to Hurrians.

We know from the Nuzi documents that in the fourteenth century the region of Arrapha—a bare fifty miles to the east of Aššur—was overwhelmingly Hurrian ethnically and politically. These Hurrians had the Lullu as their immediate neighbors farther to the east. Conquest of the Hurrians in the Arrapha area was clearly one of the first steps in the expansion of Assyria. The Nuzi records have preserved echoes of those combats.⁷⁴ Is it at all probable that the Assyrian rulers, never prone to play down their own victories, would maintain absolute silence in this case, while they are voluble about their successes all over the rest of this area? Even if further confirmation were lacking, we should still have to identify the Subarians in the period from Aššur-uballiṭ I to Shalmaneser I with the eastern Hurrians, especially since the end of the Nuzi phase falls precisely within this period. But we do have additional confirmation. The Subarians of Tukulti-Ninurta I and his successors are located to the west of Assyria, just as Hurrians—and more particularly so this time—are found in the same quarter. To meet this objection, Gelb has sought to draw a distinction between places assigned to Mitanni-Ḫanigalbat and those that are listed as Subarian, his inference being that only the first group is to be viewed as Hurrian.⁷⁵ We have seen, however, that the second group includes Katmuḫi with its Hurrian form and its succession of Hurrian rulers, not to mention other places in the same category.⁷⁶ Assyrian usage in this respect thus remains consistent throughout and in complete conformity to the facts of Assyrian history. Gelb's exclusive Subarian hypothesis can find here neither aid nor comfort.

In final retrospect, the combined evidence from the south and the north yields this result: Back in the third millennium Subartu appears to have had a specific geographic connotation with reference to a northerly area situated close to Elam. By the end of that millennium, however, a more general meaning came to attach to 'Subarian'—for reasons that cannot as yet be ascertained. In the south the term could be used broadly for the north and the

northerners, and perhaps also for speakers of certain languages. In the north, on the other hand, 'Subarian' was the local equivalent of 'Hurrian,' as used either in an ethnic or a political sense.

IV

In conclusion, a few remarks are in order concerning some of the terms which figure frequently in connection with Subarian inquiries. One of these is Ras Shamra alphabetic *šbr* (or *š̄br*).⁷⁷ To one group of scholars, including Gelb, this term means nothing else than 'Subarian.'⁷⁸ C. G. v. Brandenstein has compared it with *Šabarra*, a land name known from a Hittite context.⁷⁹ Writing in 1933 (AASOR 13. 23) I expressed myself in favor of the first view. Subsequent study, however, convinced me that this could not be correct. After indicating my reasons for the later conclusion, I added that Brandenstein's suggestion "may be right."⁸⁰ Since Gelb appears to have misunderstood my argument, I shall try to restate it very briefly.

The Ras Shamra symbol transcribed as *š* or *š̄* is used to render the [š] in such Hurrian names as *Tešub*, *Šauška*, and *Šimige*. In syllabic writings this sound is usually written double in medial position; and it is rendered invariably with *š*-signs only.⁸¹ On the other hand, whenever *š*-signs interchange with *s*- or *z*-signs, the underlying sibilant corresponds to RŠ *z̄*; cf. *ḫa-zi-ib*- alongside the far more common *ḫa-ši-ib*-, and note RŠ *ḫz̄l̄z̄*.⁸² Analogously, the Hurrianizing syllabary⁸³ writes Akk. [š] < PS [t̄], as in (*w*)*ašābum*, invariably with *š*-signs only, whereas Akk. [š] < PS [š̄, š̌] can be written not only with *š*-signs but also with *s*- and *z*-signs, and is so found in forms of *šimtum* and *šaṭārum* at Nuzi.⁸⁴ Now since *S/Zu-ba-ri* occurs in the Amarna material and *Šu-ba-ri* at Boğazköy^{84a}—both sources being instances of the Hur-

⁷⁷ Cf. Speiser, IH 3 n. 8 and *ibid.* 31 ff.

⁷⁸ HaS 20 f.

⁷⁹ ZDMG 91 (1937) 570 n. 1.

⁸⁰ IH 3 n. 8.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* 31 ff., and add J. Friedrich, *Orientalia* 12 (1943) 6 ff.

⁸² IH 33 ff.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 12 f.

⁸⁴ For the Nuzi syllabary see M. Berkooz, *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian*, Language Dissertations 23 (1937) 9 ff.; Goetze, *Language* 14 (1938) 134-7; P. M. Purves, *AJSL* 57 (1940) 162 ff. Note also Speiser, *JAOS* 58 (1938) 189 ff. and *Language* 16 (1940) 319 ff.

^{84a} Cf. HaS 48 f.

⁷⁴ JEN 525 and *JAOS* 47 (1927) 9 f.

⁷⁵ HaS 46.

⁷⁶ See above, p. 6, and cf. Goetze, *JNES* 5. 166 ff.

rianizing syllabary—it follows that the initial sound could properly be expressed only by alphabetic $\bar{z}$, not $\bar{s}$. Consequently RŠ $\bar{s}br$ cannot be related to *Šubarû*.

The land-name *Šubria/e* is taken for granted as a cognate of Subartu. That *Šubr-* might develop from *Šubarû-* through syncope, and that the adjectival form *Šubriyu* could thus stand for 'Subarian' cannot be doubted. But that the name of a country in the region of Lake Van should have been derived from an Assyrian term used in a distinctly secondary application is not to be conceded without better proof than has yet been adduced.⁸⁵ A local source for such a name appears far more likely. Gelb's attempted use of a Hurrian passage as an instance of the equation *Šubria*=*Šubarû* (or the like) is unfortunate.⁸⁶

Various attempts have been made from time to time to associate *šubur/subar* with *hubur*, since syllabary material links these terms under the two heads of (a) Subartu and (b) 'earth.'⁸⁷ With Hurrian *ha/uwur* independently attested as 'earth, below,'⁸⁸ the way seemed clear for the further etymological equation *Subar(tu)*=*Hurr(i)*;⁸⁹ the more so since the last term appears in the Tušratta letter in the form *hurw-* alongside *hurr-*, and since metathesis under the influence of [r] is a common occurrence with the Hurrians.⁹⁰ Yet attractive though this particular comparison might

be in some respects,⁹¹ it is no longer possible. For it can now be shown that the form *hurw-* is not primary—as had been reasonable to suppose—but purely secondary. The evidence is as follows.

One Nuzi text dealing with the making of bricks (HSS V 97) states (lines 6-8): *2 li-im libnāti^{pl} i-na Nu-zi (?) i-la-bi-it a-na za-zu-um-ma ippuš^{uš} (8) a-na a-ma-ar-wu-um-ma ippuš^{uš} "he(!) shall produce two thousand mud bricks in Nuzi; he shall make (them) into z. (divide into individual bricks?); he shall make (them) into a."* The complex *amarwumma ippuš* appeared to contain the usual Hurrian and Semitic components that go for the most part into the *-umma epēšu* type of construction; and *amarw-* seemed to fit nicely into a Hurrian pattern. In a parallel text, however, which has since appeared (HSS XIII 387), we read (10-12): *libnāti^{pl} (11) i-la-bi-nu ù za-zu-um-ma ippuš^u (12) ù a-ma-ra im-ḥa-šú* "they shall produce the mud bricks, and make z., and strike (?) a." The precise technical meaning of *amāra ma-ḥāšu* is not clear, nor need it concern us at present. What does matter is the fact that *amarwumma* turns out to contain Akk. *amāru* 'brick frame,' or the like; cf. *šiga*=*amāru*, Deimel, ŠL 567. 2, 23, 30. Hence the *-w-* in *amarwumma* is a secondary development between *-r-* and *-u-*, in a dialect spoken by Hurrians. Since the occurrence of *-w-* in *Hurwu-(u)-hé* (Mit. I 19, II 68, III 113, IV 127) furnishes a complete analogy, and since the alternate *Hur-ru-u-hé* is also found in the same carefully written document (Mit. I 14, III 6), the *-w-* must be a secondary development. And with the labial thus eliminated, the prospect of an etymological connection between *subar-* and *hurr-* likewise disappears. There still remains the possibility of a relationship between *šubur*, *hubur* on the one hand and *ha/uwur* on the other, with an underlying meaning 'earth, below.' But we have at present no way of judging how plausible such a combination might be, or whether it would signify—if confirmed—anything more than borrowing by the one group from the other.

Lastly, the problem of *namru(m)* as applied to Subarian slaves has been brought up once again. I had occasion to deal with it at considerable length in MO 102-8. The general procedure had been to interpret the term in the sense of 'light,' more specifically, 'light-colored, fair-skinned.' On

⁸⁵ The evidence cited by Gelb, *ibid.* 29, does not support automatically the conclusions drawn with regard to *Šubria* (*ibid.* 47 f. and JNES 5.166).

⁸⁶ It was briefly criticized by Goetze, JNES 5.168 n. 29. The phrase *šu-ub-ri-ia-na-aš dTeššub-aš* (KUB XXVII 46 i 19 and ff.; Gelb transliterates *šu-ub-ri-ia-na-aš dU-up-aš*) cannot simply be translated with Gelb as "Šubrian Tešup" (HaS 30). For in the first place, *šubri-* in the passages in question is combined with *ehli*, which is certainly not a place name. Secondly, where the text deals with place names it does not fail to mark them as such; cf. *ša-bi-nu-we-ḥi-na-aš*, line 20, same context. And finally, adjectival use of place names would call for such formatives as *-we* or *ḥi*; e.g., *Im-ma-aš-ku-un ew-ri e-we-er-ne* (14) [c] *Lu-ul-lu-e-ne-we* . . . *IKi-ik-li-pa-ta-al-li-in Du-uk-ri-iš-ḥi e-bi-ir-ni* "Immašk was (-n) king of Lullu; . . . Kiklib-adal was the Tukrišite king" (KUB XXVII 38 iv 13-14).

⁸⁷ Cf. HaS App. I, pp. 92 ff.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 93 n. 11; Speiser, IH 100.

⁸⁹ Cautiously weighed by Goetze, JAOS 57 (1937) 108.

⁹⁰ For such metathesis in Hurrian words see IH 68, and add Hurr. *hubrušbi*: Ugar. *ḥrbt* (Friedrich, ZDMG 96 (1942) 471 ff. For the same process in Semitic words at Nuzi cf. *birqu*: *baqāru*; note also Nuzi *gurpizu*: Akk. *gursipu* (e.g., D. Cross, *Movable Property* 57 and n. 134).

⁹¹ As long as it seemed to be favored by independent considerations.

this basis had been constructed far-reaching theories as to the racial characteristics of the Subarians and the Gutu, although no proof could be found anywhere that the word ever had any bearing on pigmentation; the commonly attested meaning of *namru* is 'shining, bright, splendid.' Moreover, in Nuzi texts with close analogies to the Old Babylonian documents dealing with Subarian slaves, the corresponding descriptive term is *damqu* 'good,' which the syllabaries designate as a synonym and a semantic analogue of *namru*. Accordingly, I took *namru* to indicate in the slave texts a value of purely commercial rather than anthropological interest. My argument was welcomed by Ungnad with this remark: "Nur auf dieses *namru* die These einer blonden und blauäugigen Bevölkerung in Subartu und Gutium aufzubauen, ist jedenfalls mit Speiser abzulehnen."⁹² It was echoed also by J. J. Stamm, who contributes this significant observation: "*Namru* kann nicht auf die Farbe des Haares oder der Haut gehen, da das Adjektiv nie als Farbbezeichnung vorkommt."⁹³

Nevertheless, Gelb would dismiss the entire argument in a single footnote. He states: "For this interpretation of *namrum* I can find no evidence in Akkadian literature."⁹⁴ No effort was made to weigh in detail the considerable amount of circumstantial evidence that had been presented. This is not the place to go into further detail. It will suffice to indicate that the substantive correspondence between the Lullu slaves of the Nuzi documents and the Subarian slaves of the Old Babylonian texts has been greatly enhanced, inasmuch as the same general region is known to be involved in both cases.⁹⁵ It follows then that the respective descriptive adjectives, *damqu* and *namru*

should likewise correspond—a conclusion which is fully borne out by independent lexical evidence. We know now, furthermore, that *damqu* was contrasted at Nuzi with *šinahilu* 'of second(ary) rank or quality.'⁹⁶ The meaning of *damqu* as a commercial term was therefore 'first-rate, first-class, fine,' and the same must apply also to *namru* in related contexts.

The one passage that Gelb has cited in support of his position is: [^{reš}*amtam*] *na-wi-ir-tam ša in-ki* [*maḥ*]-*ra-at* (VAS XVI 65. 12 f.). This he translates, with P. Kraus,⁹⁷ "a light(-colored) slave girl who is pleasing to your eye." Just how the mention of an eye-catching slave girl makes the accompanying *nawirtam* refer to color is not explained. Yet Gelb does not hesitate to speak farther on (p. 88) of "the fact that Subarian slaves were called 'light,' in the sense of 'light-colored,'" the only support for that alleged fact being his earlier footnote. It would seem that Subarians are difficult enough to accommodate as it is, without the severe additional handicap of a distinctive and—for that area—atypical pigmentation.

How would a speaker of Akkadian refer to light-colored persons if he were so minded? The one clear instance of reference to color—however obscure the underlying meaning—is the stereotype *šalmāt qaqqādi* 'the dark-headed ones';⁹⁸ in the cultural pattern of ancient Mesopotamia it was this shading, and not its opposite, that was viewed as pleasing in people. The meaning 'light-colored, blond' would have to be sought among the antonyms of *šalmu*. Two such antonyms immediately come to mind. One is the common *pešū* 'white, light,' which is contrasted with *šalmu* in such instances as the standard animal list.⁹⁹ The other is *bašlu*, which is similarly contrasted with *šalmu* in lists of garments, and the like.¹⁰⁰ and has plausibly been explained in that connection as meaning 'bleached.'¹⁰¹ In other words, Akkadian had at least two terms to designate light skin or complexion, one for the natural and the other for the artificially induced variety. Neither was used in the texts under discussion. Evidently, therefore, neither meaning was wanted.

⁹² *Subartu* 105.

⁹³ *Die akkadische Namengebung* (MV AeG 44) 248 n. 4; also the common use of *namru* / *nawir* in the sense of 'shining' in onomastic compounds, *ibid.* 184.

⁹⁴ HaS 43 n. 138. It is to be regretted that Gelb has sought to read hidden motives into the arguments of those with whom he takes issue, when he says (*ibid.*): "It would seem that Speiser's and Ungnad's reaction against the normal interpretation of *namrum* as 'light (-colored)' was caused by their assumption that Hurrians or Subarians belonged to the Armenoid race, which according to them could hardly be called light-colored." Speaking for myself, my "reaction against the normal interpretation of *namrum*" was prompted by the circumstance that that view is both unenlightening and unsupported. Assuredly, we are all interested in facts far more than in favored theories.

⁹⁵ See above, p. 8 and cf. n. 53.

⁹⁶ AASOR 16. 134.

⁹⁷ MV AeG 36. 1 (1932) 59 f.

⁹⁸ Adduced already in MO 106.

⁹⁹ Cf. B. Landsberger, *Fauna* 8. 89-90.

¹⁰⁰ RA 36. 130 (SMN 1422) 25.

¹⁰¹ E. R. Lacheman, *apud* Starr, *Nuzi* I 543. For the chemical connotation of *bašlu* see also W. von Soden, *Orientalia* 16. 445.